

REMARKS

Interview Summary

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his courtesy extended to Applicant's representative Larry T. Cullen during an interview on July 12, 2007. The Examiner and the Applicant's representative discussed US 5,548,648 (Yorke-Smith) in light of claims 2 and 5 of the present application. Applicant explained that the prior art does not disclose at least to combine a cipher portion with a residual block and to encrypted the combination. It is Applicant's understanding that the Examiner generally agreed with Applicant and will consider Applicant's explanation further upon presentation of this amendment. Applicant also explained that a claim set similar to claim 5 would be presented with just a focus on encrypting or decrypting.

Claim Changes

Claims 2 and 5 are amended to clarify and simplify the language.

Claims 6-11 have been newly added, as discussed in the meeting dated July 12, 2007. Support for the new claims can be found at least in originally filed claims 3, 4, 5, and on page 5, lines 8-10 of the originally filed specification. Thus, no new matter is added.

No amendment made is related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment is made for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant had argued herein that such amendment is made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references. Any remarks made herein with respect to a given claim or amendment are intended only in the context of that specific claim or amendment, and should not be applied to other claims, amendments, or aspects of Applicant's invention.

Rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5548648 (Yorke-Smith)

Claim 1 has been canceled. Therefore, the rejection of claim 1 is now believed to be moot.

Rejection of Claims 2-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over US 5548648 (Yorke-Smith) in view of US 5619575 (Koopman).

Applicant has amended the claims to clarify the invention. Applicant therefore respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 2-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yorke-Smith in view of Koopman.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Yorke-Smith and Koopman does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations as set forth in independent claim 2. Specifically, independent claim 2 recites “encrypting the subdivided fields using a first key to form cipher blocks” and “encrypting the second cipher subblock and the residual portion together with the second authentication block using a second key to form a cipher residual block,” which are not taught or suggested in Yorke-Smith.

Yorke-Smith is directed to encrypting data into a plurality of control and encrypted data blocks by dividing the data into data segments. Yorke-Smith, Abstract. Each data segment is encrypted by an encryption function in conjunction with an encryption key (Col. 3, lines 55-60). Different encryption functions and encryption keys are selected from the range of available encryption functions (F1 to Fi) and encryption keys (K1 to Ki), respectively. The selected encryption function and the selected encryption key are used together to encrypt a data segment (Col. 3, line 66 to Col. 4, line 3). Specifically, encryption is performed only once at step 460 of figure 4. Thus, Yorke-Smith discloses that the data segments are encrypted once by a combination of the selected encryption function and the selected encryption key.

As explained in the Interview, Yorke-Smith does not disclose Applicant's claimed limitation of “encrypting the subdivided fields using a first key to form cipher blocks” and “encrypting the second cipher subblock and the residual portion together with the second authentication block using a second key to form a cipher residual block,” The combination of Yorke-Smith with Koopman also fails to disclose Applicant's claimed invention. Thus, claim 2 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

For the above reasons, Applicant submits that claim 2 is not obvious in view of the combination of Yorke-Smith and Koopman, and therefore that the rejection of claim 2 under 35 USC 103(b) should be withdrawn. Applicant requests that claim 2 now be passed to allowance. Dependent claims 3 and 4 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claim 2. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of dependent claims 3 and 4 and requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Applicant has added new claims 6-11, as discussed with the Examiner in the meeting on July 12, 2007. New claims 6-11 include some of the limitations of independent claim 5, which is indicated as allowable in the Office Action dated April 5, 2007. Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 6-11 are in proper condition for allowance and requests that claims 6-11 may now be passed to allowance.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicant. Should the Examiner have any questions, comments, or suggestions, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's attorney or agent at the telephone number indicated below.

Please charge any fees that may be due to Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc.

Dated:

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Larry T. Cullen
Registration No.: 44,489
Tel.: (215) 323-1797

Attorney for Applicant